Remarks

In response to the final office action of June 24, 2005, Applicant submits this paper. Claims 1-2 and 9-11 remain pending. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the recitations of claim 3. Claims 4-8 have been cancelled. New claims 12-15 have been added. No new issues are raised by this amendment. Support for the amendment may be found at least in Figures 4 and 6 and the related disclosure.

Claims 1, 9, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gao. Applicant traverses the rejection.

As amended, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

> "...said graphical user interface displaying form content
> and HTML content in a common window,
>
> wherein said form content and said HTML content
> are displayed in a Java applet execution in a browser."

Gao fails to disclose form content and HTML content in a Java applet execution in a browser. To reject claim 3, the Examiner argues that:

> "Gao teaches the form content and the HTML content are
> displayed in a Java applet execution a [sic] browser *(e.g.,*
> *Java applets... executed ... browser; para. 0016).*"
> Emphasis original.

Gao does not disclose what the Examiner suggests. Rather, Gao discloses multimedia viewers 422 and controls 424 (arguably Java applets) being displayed in an HTML browser. This is not what is claimed. Claim 1 recites that the "said form content and said HTML content are displayed in a Java applet execution". No where does Gao disclose any HTML content inside a Java execution.

Further, Applicant traverses the Examiner's comment that the "form elements" and the "common window" of claim 1 are not giving patentable weight because "the recitation occurs in the preamble." Applicant notes that the recited terms are not in the preamble of claim 1. Thus, the cases cited by the Examiner do not apply. Accordingly, these terms must be given patentable weight.

Applicant submits that claim 1, as amended, is allowable over Gao.

Applicants further submit claim 9 is allowable. Claim 9 recites:

> "said processor receives form content from a Java applet
> and HTML content from said Java applet, combines said
> form content and said HTML content in a browser program
> and outputs the combined content to said display."

Here, the form content and the HTML content are both used within the Java applet, which is not disclosed in Gao. The multimedia viewers 422 and controls 424 do not disclose any HTML content being displayed in them. Rather, they are displayed at the same level as other HTML content in the browser frame. Accordingly, as Gao fails to disclose any form content created by a Java applet, which later houses HTML content, claim 9 is allowable over Gao.

Dependent claim 11 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 2 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over the combination of Gao in view of Kulkarni. Applicant traverses this rejection.

Kulkarni fails to teach or suggest the recitations described above with respect to claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, claims 2 and 10 are allowable at least as being dependent on claims 1 and 9, respectively.

New claims 12-15 relate to a system for displaying HTML content within a Java execution, which is displayed in a browser window. Claims 12-15 are believed allowable.

All rejections have been addressed. If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned to further the prosecution of the invention.

Please charge any fee associated with the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 19-0733.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
Christopher R. Glembocki
Registration No. 38,800

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1001 G Street, N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 824-3000
Dated: March 1, 2006